

THE  
ANSWER

OF

The Friend in the West,

TO

A LETTER

FROM

A Gentleman in the East, entitled,

*The present State of the Colony of Connecticut  
considered.*

N. B. This ANSWER happened to fall into the  
Hands of a Gentleman, who thought it best that  
it should be communicated to the PUBLICK.

NEW-HAVEN:

Printed and Sold by James Parker, at the Post-Office, near  
the Hay-Market, 1755.





## The ANSWER to a LETTER, &c.

DEAR SIR,

I RECEIVED yours, in Answer to my Queries; for which I thank you: But am sorry to see it in print, since upon further Consideration, and Conversation with some Gentlemen well acquainted with the State of the Colony and of *Yale College*, the Doubts which I then had have very much subsided; and upon reading what you have wrote, I am considerably inclined to the other Side of the Question: For it seems to me, that sundry Articles are exaggerated, and your Manner of representing Things tends to create a general Uneasiness and Disturbance in the Colony, and a Suspicion in the Minds of the most judicious Gentlemen, that you had some Design, which you did not chuse in plain Terms to declare.

Your representing the Colony of *Connecticut* to be at this Time in such an extraordinary distressed State, for Want of Money in the Treasury to pay their Debts, seems to all Gentlemen I have convers'd with, to be without Foundation. They say, the Colony never were so near out of Debt, as they are now, or lately have been. The Colony has generally been in Debt, for 30 or 40 Years, *three or four Hundred Thousand Pounds*, for Bills emitted: But by the last Report of the Committee you mention, the Colony was not only quite out of Debt, but had much more than enough in the Treasury to pay off all the outstanding Bills: And tho' the State of the Treasury can't be precisely known, till all the said Bills are actually brought in; yet 'tis certain, that the Government was but little in Debt, and probably had considerable Overplus in the Treasury, till the last Emission a few Months ago.

B

Your

Your reducing all Accounts kept in Sterling and lawful Money, to *Rhode-Island* Old Tenor, (which has twelve Times as much Sound as Substance,) and your amassing and heaping together the annual Expences of the College for 50 Years, is conceived as a Design to amuse Mankind.--- It is observed by some Gentlemen, that the Expences of an ordinary Family, for 40 or 50 Years, would amount to Thirty or Forty Thousand Pounds.--- That the Expences for *Pipes* and *Tobacco*, in this Colony, as was lately observed in the General Assembly, were at least Sixty Thousand Pounds *per Annum*:--- For *Tea*, Two Hundred Thousand: --- For *Rum*, Four Hundred Thousand. All which in 50 Years, amount to above Thirty Millions of Pounds. Many People will be much amused by such Computations, and think it impossible so much should be either got or spent: And yet some Gentlemen are of Opinion, that the annual Expences of the Colony are near Three Hundred Millions of Pounds.

As Colleges are the great Supports of Religion and Learning, I can't but think, that *One Thousandth Part* of what is spent in Superfluities, might better be expended for such a pious and noble Purpose. *Millar*, in his Account of the University of *Cambridge*, p. 148, says, that "the Revenues of the two Universities are computed to be above Fifty Thousand Pounds, (i. e. £. 750,000, Old Tenor,) " which, says he, is almost wholly expended for the Encouragement of the Study of Divinity, and the Education of Ministers." This is above Twenty-one Thousand Pounds to each of the 35 Colleges in those Universities, which is five Times so much as the Revenues of *Yale College*, by your Computation. And yet each of those Colleges, one with another, have not so many Students as ours: For the whole Number in both Universities, according to *Chamberlyn*, is but about 4500; whereas 35 such Colleges as ours would make above 5000.

The College at *Cambridge*, in *New-England*, is much better endowed than ours; and yet I am credibly informed, that the Publick give about Five Thousand Pounds our Old Tenor, towards the annual Support of it. The Province of *New-York* give Five Hundred Pounds, i. e. £. 4500, Old Tenor, for the

the annual Support of their College. *New-Jersey* and *Pennsylvania*, consisting chiefly of *Quakers*, do Nothing in their publick Capacity: But by private Donations a College is building in *New-Jersey*, which will cost much more than both ours: And the Trustees have lately sollicited and secured private Benefactions from *Europe*, to that College, to the Amount of near Four Thousand Pounds Sterling; *i. e.* £. 60,000, Old Tenor: which is more than half so much as this Colony have given to this College in Fifty-two Years, by your Account. A Gentleman from *Philadelphia* lately said, that there were Instances, wherein some one private Gentleman gives *annually* near as much to their Academy or College, as the whole Colony of *Connecticut* does to *Yale-College*. *Virginia* give to their College a Duty upon Rum, &c. supposed generally to amount to near Ten Thousand Pounds Old Tenor *per Annum*.

So that if the Incomes of *Yale College* were as great as you represent them; yet it would probably be the poorest College in the World, at least of its Age: But I am assured, from some Gentlemen, who have seen the College Accounts, that you have in several Instances over-magnified and misrepresented them.

You say, there is in the College Treasury, £. 2136 - 1 - 3 Old Tenor; which is more than there is in the Colony Treasury, if their Debts were all paid. To make out which, you say, --- that the 87 Ounces of Silver, the Rents of the College Land, has been duly received four Years past; whereas there is but a small Part of it which has been due so long: And of the £. 87, Sterling, of those Incomes, which you say is now in the College Treasury, it appears, by the Accounts settled in *November* last, that there is only £. 27.

Some again think and say, it is unfair in you to represent it as tho' all the Money contained in the *Quarter-Bills*, was a proper Revenue or Income of College; since 2 or 300 *per Ann.* in those Bills, is properly Nothing but the Debts of the Scholars to Mechanicks and Workmen: For as every Student is by Law obliged to keep his Glafs, &c. in repair, the Officers of College see that it is truly and justly done, by assessing, collecting and paying the Money.

Again, you represent the building the President's House, as being wholly at the publick Charge ; whereas those who have seen the old Accounts of the College, inform me, that near £. 1500, of it was given by Governor *Yale*, and other private Gentlemen.

It is further observed, by some judicious Gentlemen, that your reckoning the Liberty of the President's House, the Degree Money, and all accidental Gratuities that have ever happened, as the publick Revenues of the College, is manifestly a Design to magnify and exaggerate every Thing, in order to amuse and prepare the Minds of the lower Sort of People, for what you have to say against a *Professor of Divinity* ; which I am sensible is at the Bottom of all.

You say, \* it will cost the Government four or five Thousand Pounds for a Settlement ; and £. 1000, or £. 1500, for a Yearly Salary. But upon this it has been observed, that you doubly over-act a Part : For if the annual Incomes of the College are as great as you represent, the College can support a *Professor* without this £. 1000, or £. 1500, especially if, as you say, the Revenues can be augmented by leasing more Lands. And if there is now £. 2136, in the College Treasury, and the Contribution, which you suppose will be very liberal from the Friends of Separate Meetings, (tho' it should be very scanty from the Friends to *Taylor's Principles*,) will probably amount to £. 2000, more ; both which will be sufficient to procure a House for a *Professor*.---So that if your Representations be just, your Endeavours to fright the Government about the Charge of a *Professor*, seems to have no Foundation.

You go on to observe, that those who are against a *Professor of Divinity*, are stigmatized with opprobrious Names, and lookt upon as Enemies to the Commonwealth of Letters, and must be glad if they can come off so. --- But as an *Englishman*, you will freely speak your Mind. --- This is a tender Point to speak or write upon ; but as an old Friend, I can't help hinting to you, what, it seems, you are pretty well acquainted with, that it is generally taken Notice of, that some Gentlemen, who used

to be generous to the College, of late talk much upon the saving Hand, and at the same Time more privately hint, that the Governors of the College are too strongly attached to a certain Set of Principles (contained in our *Catechism* and *Confession of Faith*;) --- that the Students are coop'd up into narrow Principles, and not allowed to think freely and generously for themselves, and to choose what Set of Principles they please; --- that there ought to be no Standard of Orthodoxy, to which all who are admitted to be publick Officers of College, should be obliged to give their Assent. These Hints and Suggestions, you know, have created some Jealousies and Suspicions about the real Principles of those who offer them.

I know indeed, it has been said by the Gentlemen, who are so much for Generosity and Freedom of Thinking, that they should not chuse or desire to have a Professor, who held or declared Principles contrary to those commonly received in the Country: --- But still it is justly suspected, that this is spoken only out of Policy, --- because they know that such a Professor would be disagreeable to the Country; and therefore they would not chuse a Professor who *declared* Principles contrary to those commonly received; but they would have one that treats those Principles as Matters of Indifference, at least, and one that would publickly say but little about many Doctrines that have been generally esteemed the *Fundamentals* of Religion: And by these Means would have a free and effectual Door left open, for Men to run into *Taylor's* Principles, or any of more fatal Consequence, as they please.

Give me Leave to say, that it would be most fair and generous, and much more agreeable to the Character of *Englishmen*, for Men freely to speak out their Sentiments upon *Religion*, as well as other Things; and that if Men seem to *conceal* and *disguise* their Principles of Religion, there are other Englishmen, who will also *freely* speak their Minds.

But to proceed with your Letter; you say, † that the Officer usually stiled a *Professor of Divinity*, in Colleges and Universities, " is appointed to teach Divinity as a Science, in a *Chair*, in the

† *Page* 9;

“ *Schools*,

“Schools, and not in a Pulpit in the Chappels.” But *Chambers*, whom you quote, gives only a short and general Account of what is common to all the Professors of all the Arts and Sciences; but has not the least Hint of his not preaching in the Pulpit in the Chappels: But if you had read the Laws of the University of *Oxford*, || you would have seen, that the Heads of Colleges, or Presidents, and the Professors of Divinity, are reckoned among the stated Preachers on the Lord’s Day, in the Chappel, (tho’ others also preach occasionally:) So that its thought you would have shewn more Modesty, if you hadn’t been so positive in that Point, before you had understood it better.

You farther say, that the President, Tutors and Scholars, are Members of the first Ecclesiastical Society in *New-Haven*; and have no more Right to set up a separate Religious Meeting in the College, than the *New-London* Society, united for Trade and Commerce.

This being a Matter of the utmost Consequence to the Religion of Colleges, upon which the Religion of whole Countries very much depends, I have set my self with the utmost Diligence to enquire into it; and have read all the Authors I could any ways procure upon that Subject:--- And upon the Whole, I think, this Proposition is evident, from a great Variety of clear and undoubted Authorities;--- *That a College or University is an Ecclesiastical Society distinct from and superior to all other Ecclesiastical Societies*; for all other Ecclesiastical Societies are for training up the common People for Religion; whereas Colleges are Societies of Ministers, for training up Persons for the Work of the Ministry.

All Authors which give any Account of the Religion and Constitution of Colleges, say, that they were originally designed for the educating Persons for the Work of the Ministry. Dr. *Ayliff*, in his Account of the University of *Oxford*, † says, that by the Canon-Law, all Universities and Colleges are Things spiritual; --- that the University of *Oxford*, was anciently stiled the second School of the Church:--- And says, no Doubt, the wise

|| *Stat. Oxon. Tit. 16, Statutum est quod quolibet Die Dominicio, Concilio habeatur per Collegiorum Praefectos, Theologis Professores, et Hebraicarum Linguarum Praelectorem.*

† *Vol. 2, page 3.*

Founders of the Colleges in our two Universities, intended to make their Foundations as much ecclesiastical, as in them lay.\*

And tho' you say, the Sanctity of Colleges is exploded since the Reformation; yet 'tis certain, they did not reform from Popery to no Religion, or *Taylorism*, but to the pure Religion of Protestants, as contained in their publick Confessions of Faith. Religion still remained to be the Constitution and Design of Colleges, as well as Parishes, and all other religious Societies. And all Colleges erected since the Reformation, particularly those in *Ireland* and *Edinburgh*, are founded on the same religious Plan: And therefore Dr. *Ayliff* gives this Definition of a College in its present State; "a College in our Universities, is "a Body joined together in Community, for the Support and "Maintenance of Religion and Learning." And herein they are distinguished from all other Societies erected for less noble Purposes. Bp. *Stillingfleet* says, "the Universities are esteemed "Parts of the Ecclesiastical Body." Every Head of a College in Priest's Orders, has the Care of Souls in such College.† *Millar*, of the University of *Cambridge*, says, "all "Fellows of Colleges, with some few Exceptions, are obliged "to be in holy Orders." All Scholars are stiled Clerks; \*\* and are obliged to wear the Habit of Clergymen.||| It was judged in the Court of *Kings-Bench*, the Statute of *Devizes* to Spiritual Corporations, extended to *Trinity-College*, because it was principally ordered for the Study of Divinity; but it would not have been extended to a College of Physicians or Civilians.|||

These Testimonies of the State and Constitution of Colleges since the Reformation, are clear Evidence, that they are Societies of a religious and ecclesiastical Nature, and entirely different from the *New-London Society* united for Trade and Commerce, or the Latin School at *New-Haven*. To say, that Religion is not the primary Design of Colleges, is as absurd as to say, that Religion is not the End and Design of Parishes, but only to maintain Schools for reading and writing; and there would be this good Colour for it, that the Law expressly obliges every Parish to maintain such a School.

\* Vol. 2, page 52. || Vol. 2, pag. 2. † Vol. 3. ‡ *Ayliff*, Vol. 2, p. 29.

\*\* *Ayliff*, Vol. 1, pag. 27. ||| *Millar*. ||| *Ayliff*.

It is also further evident, that Colleges are in their Nature, Constitution and Design, of greater Importance than, and superior to any other religious Society or particular Parish. In Episcopal Countries they are equal to a Bishoprick; and in Presbyterian Societies, equal to a Presbytery. In *England*, the Heads of the Universities may sit in the General Convocation, and have the Power of Excommunication;\* --- and are subject to no Ecclesiastical Authority lower than the Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*.† In *Scotland* the Universities send Delegates to the General Assembly of the Church, and are subject to no lower Ecclesiastical Authority.† It must therefore be inconsistent and preposterous, that a College, upon which the Religion of a whole Country very much depends, should be subject to the Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction of the next neighbouring Parish.--- The Religion of it cannot be safe under such a Constitution.

The Right of carrying on all Religious Worship by themselves, is a Privilege necessarily resulting from the Nature and Constitution of Colleges; which they have enjoyed in common with all other Ecclesiastical Societies or Parishes, for Time immemorial; as is evident from Dr. *Ayliff's* Account of the Chaplains, Chappels and Manner of Worship, in each particular College in the University of *Oxford*;--- and from the Statutes of that University; \*†\* which order, that the publick Worship and Administration of the Eucharist on the Lord's Day, be carried on, sometimes in each particular College by themselves, sometimes by all the Colleges together in the Church of *St. Mary* (which has from the Beginning belonged to the University) by the Presidents, Professors, and others, under the Authority and Direction of the University.

In the 23d Canon of the English Convocation, *A. D. 1603*, it is ordered, that in all Colleges and Halls in both Universities, the Masters and Fellows shall be careful, that all their Pupils be thoroughly instructed in Points of Religion, and diligently attend the publick Service, Sermons, and the holy Communion, which we ordain to be administred in all such Colleges and Halls on the first or second Sunday in every Month.

† *Ayliff.* . . . † *Wood's Institutes*, p. 549. *Annals Univ. Coll.* p. 351.

\* *Present State of Great Britain*, p. 32. \*†\* *Tit. 16.*

It has been said, that the Reason why the Universities worship by themselves, is because so great a Number cannot conveniently meet with a particular Parish; and that these Privileges do not belong to them as Colleges, but by Virtue of some later Grant from the Civil Power. Upon which I would observe;

1. That the Reason why the particular Colleges meet by themselves, can't be on Account of their Number, because, take one with another, it is not so great as the Number of Students in ours, as I before observed.
2. It is evident, from Dr. *Ayliff's* Account, that there never was any positive, direct and express Grant from any Authority civil or ecclesiastical, that the Colleges should meet by themselves; but that was always implied, and taken for granted, in their very Nature and Constitution.
3. The Colleges have been distinct ecclesiastical Societies in Fact, and by Custom and Prescription for four or five Hundred Years; which is as strong an Authority as can be produced any Parish in *England*.

But you say,\* you see Nothing in the Acts of the General Assembly, which gives *Yale College* such a Right. To which I answer,--- A Grant for erecting any Company or Society to any particular Purpose, by a Name known in the Common-Law, conveys the same Privileges to that Company or Society, as the Law generally gives to all other Societies under that Name. There may be some small Variations understood or expressed under some particular Circumstances. But this must be the general Rule of construing all Grants; or otherwise they will be altogether unintelligible and uncertain.

Therefore, when the General Assembly constituted a College or collegiate School, (for the Words are promiscuously used in the second and third Charters,) the Law makes them such a College as other Colleges generally are by Common-Law: And the first Charter expressly declares it to be, *a Religious Undertaking for Religious Purposes and Designs, and for propagating Religion, by a Succession of learned and orthodox Men.* And in

\* Page 11.

1753, the Assembly expressly declare, that the principal End proposed in erecting and supporting it, was to supply the Churches with a learned, pious and orthodox Ministry.

You concede, that the Words in the College-Charter,---“ Power to chuse, &c. Professors, and all other Officers usually appointed in Colleges and Universities,” --- imply a Power to chuse all such Officers as are common to almost all Colleges and Universities; which is enough for the present Case: For it is certain that a Preacher on the Lord’s-Day is an Officer common to almost all Colleges and Universities: --- But whether they have Power, or whether it would be ridiculous for them to chuse such an Officer, as, under their Circumstances, they have not the least Occasion for, is Nothing to the present Purpose;--- and seems, like many Things about Deans, Vicars, &c. to be put in only to amuse.

But then it is not said, in express Terms, that this Professor or Preacher shall preach in a Pulpit in the College-Hall or Chappel; or that the College may meet there separately by themselves on the Lord’s-Day.---It appears to me, that there is not the least Occasion for it; for there is no such express Terms in any Law, giving such a Power to any Minister or Parish in the Colony, and probably not in the World: And if the Ecclesiastical Powers of the first Parish in *New-Haven* (to which you say the College belongs) were enquired into, they would be found to be much less explicit than those of the College.

It is said by some Gentlemen of good Intelligence, that there never was any Act of Assembly which did expressly constitute *New-Haven* either a Town or a Parish, tho’ there are sundry later Acts which suppose them to be such. They were for many Years only a voluntary Company of Men, who met for religious Worship, without Law, or any original Constitution from the civil Power: And the first Act or Law, under which they can claim to be a Parish, is so late as the Year 1726; † which supposes, that when a Parish is set off from a Town, the remaining Part may be formed into a Parish; and therefore enacts how it should be done, with a *Proviso*, that where any

† Connecticut Old Law-Book, pag. 335:

had

had already acted as separate Parishes, that Law should not annul their Doings. It seems then, that the Parish to which you say the College is subject, did, for many Years both before and after the College was settled there, act as a Parish without Law, and their Acts are saved only by that *Proviso*. So that some have said by Way of retorting, that the College was the first legal Ecclesiastical Society; and what Authority had the Town to separate from them? or, if the Law of 1726, made them a legal Society, yet what Jurisdiction could that give them over the College, which was a legal Ecclesiastical Society many Years before?

There were indeed ancient Laws, which empowered Towns and Parishes to make Rates for the Support of Ministers; --- but whether these Ministers had Power to preach in the Pulpit on the Lord's-Day, or only to teach Divinity as a Science in a *Chair* for that Purpose on the Week-Day; or whether the People of each particular Parish had a Right to meet separately by themselves on the Lord's-Day, or only hear Lectures in the Week, and join with some other Parish on the Lord's-Day; --- is no where expressly said in our Colony Law-Book. These Things were always taken by Custom, Implication and Common Law, from the Nature of a Parish, --- and much more strongly from the Nature of a College.

As the present State of the Town of *New-Haven* is well known to be so very different from the State of *Cambridge*, I find but very few if any of your Mind, that this College can at present, if ever, so well meet with the Town, as the College there. Some Months ago, there was a Motion made by some Gentlemen of *New-Haven*, that the Professor of Divinity appointed by the College should preach half the Time in the Meeting-House, and that the Scholars should constantly attend there. Upon which the Corporation proposed two or three Preliminaries: One was, *That the Parish give Liberty to the Scholars to sit in the Front Gallery*, without paying about £. 40, per annum. Another was, *that the Professor should have free Liberty to preach up all the Doctrines contained in our Catechism and Confession of Faith*, without Offence to said Parish; and *that no contrary Doctrines should be preached there while the College should there attend*. These Gentlemen

Gentlemen didn't see Cause to comply with either of these preliminary Conditions: And further, objected against that Act of the Corporation, *That if any Professor of Divinity, after he had given his Consent to the Catechism and Confession of Faith, should fall from his Profession, and embrace any other Set of Principles, (as Arianism, Arminianism, &c.) he would be obliged to resign:* And so, as I am informed, the Treaty came to an End.

You further say in your Letter,\* "that all that Mr. President " has advanced from the Powers of the Colleges in *England*, " which are distinct Corporations, falls at once." It is observed by some Gentlemen, that this seems to be a meer Triumph over Nothing. Altho' it is in Fact evident, that the several *legislative* Powers in the Plantations, whether Corporations or not, have Power, and in Fact do make Corporations for many Purposes, (tho' not Companies of Merchants) yet Mr. President does not argue, that *Yale College* had a Right to meet by themselves, barely because they are a Corporation; ---no;--- but from this, that they are a Corporation, Guild or Fraternity, (which you please) for Religious Purposes, as all Parishes are;---and such a Company or Fraternity for Religious Purposes, you concede, the Assembly can make; which is all that is necessary to the present Case.

But you say,|| that "the Officers of the College, and their " Worship, hazard the publick Peace and Religion, if not " consistent with the Constitution of the Colony."-- Very true: ---But it makes some Men smile, when they suppose that this comes from such as, upon other Occasions, say, "that the " Governors of the College are Bigots to the Principles con- " tained in the Religious Constitution of the Colony; and " that it is Imposition upon Men's Consciences, to oblige them " to consent to our Confession of Faith, as a Standard of " Orthodoxy." Yet now this is conceded to be necessary for the publick Peace and Safety of Religion.

You go on to say, + "Mr. President has set up preaching in " the College Hall, but it is not as yet known under what eccle- " siastical Constitution." It seems strange this is not known, since

by the Laws of the College printed many Years ago, and by the Practice ever since, every principal Officer gives his Consent to the ecclesiastical Constitution of the Churches in this Colony, as established by Law: Why should you then add, "I hope Mr. President has no Design to change our Constitution, and introduce a more pompous One:" Others would be glad if they had as good Reason to hope, that none had a Design to change our Religion, and introduce *Taylor's Principles, and Arminianism.*

You say,† you "have heard Mr. President say, that he supposes *Yale College* has a Right to chuse Deputies to represent them in the General Assembly."--- I have good Authority to inform you, that the President declares this to be an absolute Fiction of your own Brain; and wonders who this intimate Friend should be, to whom he should commit this important Secret, before he had given any Hint of it to any of the Fellows or Tutors;--- and says, that there can't be the least Colour for it, inasmuch as this Privilege does not belong to any ecclesiastical Society as such; nor do the Universities hold it by antient Prescription, but by a late Grant from K. James the First.

Altho' the Question, *Who were the Founders of the College?* is not much to the present Purpose; yet since you seem to lay so much Stress upon it, I think I can, upon good Authority inform you, that the Design of Erecting a College in *Connecticut* was first concerted by the Ministers, who nominated or desired ten Ministers to be Undertakers, Partners or Trustees;--- that these ten Ministers were a Company or Society by Compact, a Year or two before they had a Charter; in which Time, they often met, and wrote Letters to Gentlemen at a Distance, and received Letters of Advice about the Constitution and Regulation of the College, and received sundry Donations for that End; of which the first Charter takes Notice in these Words, --- " Goods, Chattels, and Sums of Money, as have heretofore already been granted, bestowed or given, towards Founding, Erecting and Endowing the School." And if they had never received any Charter at all, they might at least have been in as good a State as the *Latin-School in New-Haven*; or perhaps as some considerable Schools in *England*, which in most Things

conduct like Corporations, tho' they have no Charter: But then they would have been destitute of some considerable Privileges, and particularly would have been no legal ecclesiastical Society: Therefore in this less perfect State, they petitioned the Assembly, that full Liberty, Right and Privilege might be granted to them, for the Founding, Endowing and Governing the School: Which was granted by passing the Charter, before procured to be drawn by Judge SEWALL and Mr. Secretary ADDINGTON, of Boston.

The Charter of 1745, says, "that the said TRUSTEES, Partners or Undertakers, in Pursuance to the aforesaid Grant, Liberty and Licence, founded a Collegiate School in New-Haven, known by the Name of *YALE-COLLEGE*.

Now the Common-Law is plain, that he is the Founder, who first erects and endows it; and not the King, who makes it a Corporation by Law. \*

If a common Person founds a College with Possessions of small Value, and the King afterwards endows it with great Revenues; yet the common Person shall be taken to be the Founder, and not the King. And this no ways denies the Power of the General Assembly; for they necessarily have the same Power over the College, as they have over all other Persons and Estates in the Colony, and a greater Power, as constant Benefactors. But, Sir, if you could influence the Assembly to withdraw their annual Grant, you would destroy this last Part of their Power!

So that the Reason why the Assembly have not manifested any Resentment at their not being denominated the Founders, is not, as you imagine, because they look'd upon it as their *own Child*; which indeed is true; but because they understood the Law and their own Charter, better than you, and saw no Reason for any Resentment at all. The King is the Founder of four or five of the Colleges in *England*, and is always stiled so; but he never manifested any Resentment, that he was not called the Founder of the other thirty Colleges, and probably

\* Ayliff, Vol. 2, p. 6. Coke 10 Rep. || Coke 2 Inst. 68. Wood's Inst. p. 115, never

never will, unless some *wise* Gentlemen on this Side the Water, should inform his Majesty what he never knew before.

Thus, *Sir*, I have given you my Sentiments on your Letter; and it seems to me, if we have any Regard to the Interest of pure Religion in the present and succeeding Generations, every Christian Patriot among us won't fail to exert himself, to promote the Interest of that Seminary, which has hitherto been so serviceable to our Country, in promoting its civil and religious Interests.

The President indefatigably pursues the religious Interest of the College, according to the ancient Principles of the Country; rightly judging that to be the original and principal worthy End of its Institution: And tho' in the calm, but steady Pursuit of this, some Gentlemen are disengaged, who have heretofore appeared friendly to the College; yet if their Friendship can't be secured and continued, but at the Forfeiture of the Religion of the College, he wisely judges it too dear a Purchase. I am glad to find he makes so bold a Stand for Orthodoxy and Truth, at a Time when Principles are insinuating themselves, and getting Foot in this Colony, which are subversive of the Religion for which our Fathers left their native Land, and repaired to the Deserts of *America*.

I am fully satisfied, that the greatest Part of this Country remain firmly fixt to the ancient Principles of it; and I hope, that the *real Friends of Religion* will use their united Influence in Favour of a Professor of Divinity; which perhaps would be the *only Bulwark* to secure the Religion of the College.--- I am sure, if they were sensible of the great and absolute Necessity of such an Officer, there could not fail to be a Number at least to contribute liberally to his Support, in the present Infant State of the College; especially since the present Burden is manifestly too hard for the President.

Truly, *Sir*, this Matter is of such Weight and Importance, that it deserves to be treated with Seriousness and Attention: And as I know you are of so generous a Make, that notwithstanding all the *Objections* you mention in your Letter, you would

would contribute liberally, and exert your whole Influence to induce others to do so, in order to settle a Professor of your own Principles and Way of Thinking in Religion; so let me beg of you, not to obstruct and hinder the Settlement of a Professor of Principles however different from yours, yet agreeable to the Religion of your Country; since you can't be absolutely certain but that you are in the Wrong:--- And if *Orthodoxy* be right, Dear Sir, *you will be found to fight against GOD*: You are fond of the Liberty of thinking as you please; pray give your Country the Liberty of thinking as they please; and don't molest them in settling a Professor of their own Religion, lest your generous Charity should be suspected, and you too justly deserve the Character of a Fomenter of Discord, and a religious Incendiary, under a Pretence of saving Money.

I can't but think, the Body of the People are freely willing to continue the Grant, (which was made in much more low and difficult Times,) which is not more to each Man, than an Half-penny Sterling, a Pint of Cyder, or one Quarter of a Pound of Tobacco, *per Annum*;--- and therefore seems too little and mean a Thing for any Man, who bears the Character of a Gentleman, to make a Clamour about, and makes it evident to the more judicious Part of Mankind, that you have some other Design at the Bottom. I am,

DEAR SIR,

6 AP 64

Your old Friend, and

very humble Servant.



卷之三